

million today this motion to instruct would encourage to have set aside in the reserve fund to have a bipartisan commission undertake this important task of reform.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the FY2006 Concurrent Budget Resolution that was reported by the House Budget Committee and narrowly passed the House on a 218–214 vote last month. I did so for a variety of reasons.

First, President Bush and the majority party in this Congress want us to keep borrowing against our future and that of our children, and perhaps their children. The budget deficit for this year is a record \$427 billion. We added \$114 billion to the deficit in February, the first time it has ever gone over \$100 billion in one month. This is how we have added more to the national debt in the past four years than in the prior two centuries of our nation's history. Therefore, a vote in favor of this budget resolution is a vote for more "borrow and spend" policies that are responsible for our country's current fiscal plight.

Second, the House-passed budget plan shortchanges many Americans who are most deserving or in need of help, including our veterans, children, and elderly. At the same time, it slashes funding for many of our nation's important priorities—education, healthcare, AM-TRAK and alternative transportation and energy initiatives, homeland security, environmental protection, job training, research and development, and small business innovation.

Let me cite a few glaring examples.

The House-passed budget cuts veterans' health care by \$14 billion below what is currently needed over the next five years. These cuts can only be achieved by imposing new fees for veterans's healthcare, or by reducing veterans' benefits such as disability pay, pension benefits, or education benefits.

It actually cuts funding for education programs by \$2.5 billion for next fiscal year relative to Fiscal Year 2005, and \$38 billion over the next five years below what is needed to maintain the status quo. It actually matches the budget President Bush sent to Congress last month, which called for the elimination of 48 education programs worth \$4.3 billion. These cuts will include \$1.3 billion less for vocational education, as well as less funding for elementary, secondary, and college aid programs.

It also fails to protect and strengthen Social Security. It calls for spending every penny of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus to continue to help finance record deficits and continued tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans. Unlike the alternative budget plan I voted for, the House-passed budget plan contains no budget enforcement mechanisms to protect the current surplus Social Security Trust Fund. Instead, President Bush and the supporters of this budget resolution advocate a Social Security privatization scheme that would weaken Social Security upon which so many elderly and disabled Americans depend just to make ends meet. In fact, there is not one cent in the House-passed budget plan to meet any of the \$754 billion price tag needed between now and 2015 to create private accounts.

Third, the House-passed budget resolution is incomplete and misleading. It does not address the ongoing costs of the U.S. military occupation of Iraq and the war on terrorism.

Then, the budget also invokes an assumption that economic growth will reduce deficits. In fact, it fails to show any deficit figures at all after 2010. Budgets should not be based on wishful thinking.

How is that we confront both increased deficits and serious program cuts in the same budget? Because the majority party in this Congress continues to push tax cuts for those who need them the least. The results are growing inequity in American society and mounting anxiety in financial markets.

I believe this Congress can and should make better choices and adopt a much more balanced and fiscally responsible alternative budget plan—one that more closely reflects the values of most Americans, the sacrifices of our men and women in uniform, and the aspirations of our children. That is why I voted for the alternative budget plan offered by my colleague, U.S. Representative JOHN SPRATT of South Carolina. Had it been adopted, it would have insisted upon more fiscal discipline with budgets that pay as you go this year and beyond. It would have offered more help and hope for all Americans to achieve greater financial security. That means investing more in the American people and in deserving programs to help create good-paying jobs, improve education, lower healthcare costs, make college more affordable, grow small businesses, keep faith with our veterans and military families, protect our homeland, and promotes environmental sustainability.

In so doing, we could build upon what has worked in the past when our economy was growing by leaps and bounds and creating millions of new jobs, as recently as the 1990s. We could abandon the fraud of supply-side economics, once and for all, step up, and reassert control over shaping our preferred economic future—one that offers more good jobs, a higher standard of living, and real economic opportunity for all of the American people. Sadly, this budget resolution takes us farther down the wrong track.

If we want to strengthen our economy again, in the future, if we want to create new, good-paying jobs for all of our people, and promote broad-based, sustainable economic development, then I believe we must become more creative and provide more support from the public and private sector for cutting-edge research and development. We have to stop borrowing and spending. We have to stop eating our seed corn. We have to provide increased and more sustained support from the public and private sectors for basic research and development.

Up to now, America has always been a nation of explorers, creators, and inventors. We need to regain that edge and ride a new wave of research and follow-on commercial development into a new age of economic growth and prosperity. But the budget resolution approval in the House last week does none of this. The supporters of the Republican budget plan don't want to keep faith and invest in the American people, increase federal support for research, development, and entrepreneurial drive, and rebuild American competitiveness in the global economy. If they did, they could not in good conscience have voted for the skewed priorities of the recently-approved budget resolution and the Draconian, counterproductive cuts it will dictate.

Ms. HERSETH. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. HERSETH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings are postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: motion to instruct on H.R. 1268, de novo; motion to instruct on H. Con. Res. 95, by the yeas and nays.

Any electronic votes will be conducted as 15-minute votes.

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1268, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND TSUNAMI RELIEF, 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question on the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1268.

The Clerk will designate the motion.

The Clerk designated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct conferees offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SABO. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 4, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

YEAS—417

Abercrombie	Berkley	Boustany
Ackerman	Berman	Boyd
Aderholt	Berry	Bradley (NH)
Akin	Biggert	Brady (PA)
Alexander	Bilirakis	Brown (OH)
Allen	Bishop (GA)	Brown (SC)
Andrews	Bishop (NY)	Brown-Waite,
Baca	Bishop (UT)	Ginny
Bachus	Blackburn	Burgess
Baird	Blumenauer	Burton (IN)
Baker	Blunt	Butterfield
Baldwin	Boehlert	Buyer
Barrett (SC)	Boehner	Calvert
Barrow	Bonilla	Camp
Bartlett (MD)	Bonner	Cannon
Barton (TX)	Bono	Cantor
Bass	Boozman	Capito
Bean	Boren	Capps
Beauprez	Boswell	Capuano
Becerra	Boucher	Cardin